REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 are pending. By the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, and claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended and claims 2, 4, and 8-17 are canceled. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 3 can be found in the claims and specification as originally filed, such as at original claims 2 and 4 and Figs. 1-4 and 17-24 and the associated disclosure. No new matter is added.

I. Rejection Under §102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Johnson.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejection, in the interest of advancing prosecution claims 1 and 3 are amended to include the limitations of non-rejected claims 2 and 4, respectively, and claims 8, 10, and 12 are canceled. Accordingly, the rejection is overcome and must be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under §103

Claims 6, 9, 11, 14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Johnson in view of Stokes. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Johnson in view of "well known prior art." Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Johnson in view of Stokes and Knox.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejections, in the interest of advancing prosecution claims 1 and 3 are amended to include the limitations of non-rejected claims 2 and 4, respectively. Claims 6 and 7 depend from amended claim 3. Claims 9, 11, and 13-17 are canceled. Accordingly, the rejections are overcome and must be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Johnson in view of *In re Larson*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to amended claims 1 and 3.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a color-correcting method comprising the steps of: printing a test image by an output unit on the basis of test image data carrying reference color development characteristic information; reading the printed test image by an input unit to obtain image data; calculating output-correcting values by the controller on the basis of the differences between the color development characteristic information included in the test image data read by the input unit and sent through a line from the input unit to the controller, and the reference color development characteristic information sent through the same line as that of the test image data from the input unit to the controller; inputting image data into an input unit; correcting the image data input into the input unit by using output-correcting values by a controller to obtain color-corrected image data; and printing an image represented by the color-corrected image data corrected by the controller by an output. Independent claim 3 is directed to a color-correcting system, and includes limitations similar to those of claim 1. Such a color-correcting method and color-correcting system are not taught or suggested by Johnson in view of *In re Larson*.

Johnson discloses a method for making high quality reproductions, that is reproductions that correspond in finished color to the color of the original image, which method operates upon the original color densities with a color correction module that has as its input the desired red, green, and blue densities, and which outputs the modified red, green, and blue densities which can be considered to be channel-independent aim control signals for the imaging device. In the event that external conditions change which prevent the desired red, green, and blue densities from being achieved when the color correction module is utilized, a neutral adjustment module is activated which takes as its inputs the red, green, and

blue aim control signals from the color correction module and outputs adjusted red, green, and blue signals which are directed to the imaging device. The derivation of the parameters for the neutral adjustment module is accomplished by the production of a hardcopy image of neutral color patches. The densities of the patches are measured and provided to the color correction module to determine the correct relationships between red, green, and blue signals output from the color correction module and the resulting densities. Johnson at Abstract.

In contrast to Johnson, the claimed invention specifies that (A) the controller calculates output-correcting values on the basis of the differences between the color development characteristic information included in the test image data and the reference color development characteristic information, (B) the color development characteristic information is sent through a line from the input unit to the controller, and (C) the reference color development characteristic information is sent through the same line as that of the test image data from the input unit to the controller. Johnson nowhere teaches or suggests these combined features of the claimed invention, or the advantages provided thereby.

By features (A), (B), and (C), the color development characteristic information and the reference color development characteristic information are sent through the same line from the input unit to the controller. As a result, the controller can precisely calculate output-correcting values on the basis of the differences between the color development characteristic information included in the test image data and the reference color development characteristic information. This is possible because both sets of data are sent through the same line, and thus under the same conditions. Thus, if conditions in the line alter one set of data, the same conditions will alter the second set of data such that accurate output-correcting values can be calculated by the controller, and high quality images can be obtained.

Johnson does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Johnson instead teaches that the parameters for the color correction circuitry are determined on the basis of the input signal

(such as R1, G1, B1) and the resulting color densities (such as Dr', Dg', Db'). Moreover, in Johnson, the input signal is sent through a first line, from the data source 12 to the color correction unit 14, and the resulting color densities are sent through a second, different line from the scanner to the computer. Thus, in Johnson, the input signal and resulting color densities are sent through separate, different lines, not the same line as in the claimed invention. Johnson can thus not provide the same degree of precise output-correcting value calculations, because Johnson cannot identify and account for any conditions that affect the signals sent in the separate lines.

In re Larson does not address these deficiencies of Johnson. *Larson* is cited only for the assertion that making parts integral is an obvious engineering design choice. However, the described features of the claimed invention are more than mere engineering design choice. The claimed features are nowhere taught or suggested by Johnson, and thus it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Johnson in the manner necessary to arrive at the claimed invention.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 would not have been obvious over Johnson, even taken with the principles of *in re Larson*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified patent application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are therefore respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further would be necessary in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Joel S. Armstrong
Registration No. 36,430

JAO:JSA

Date: August 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461